

REMARKS

Claims 1, 12 and 21-27 are pending. Claims 2-11 and 13-21 have been cancelled. Claim 1 has been amended and new Claims 22-27 have been added. Support for the amendments can be found throughout the specification, such as, e.g., Example 1. Support for the new claims can be found in, e.g., the originally filed claims. No new matter is added. Favorable consideration of the currently pending claims is respectfully requested in light of the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

Interview record
OK
/MLP/
08/11/08

Interview Summary

Applicants appreciate the opportunity to discuss this application during the telephonic interview conducted with Examiner Padgett on April 10, 2008, and agree with the comments provided by the Examiner in the Interview Summary paper mailed April 11, 2008.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103:

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected the then-pending claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Connell *et al.* (UK 1,037,144) (“Connell”) in view of Timmons *et al.* (5,876,753) (“Timmons”) or vice versa. In addition, the Examiner rejected the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Timmons in view of Kolluri *et al.* (5,723,219) (“Kolluri”), and Timmons in view of Chabreck *et al.* (WO 98/28026) (“Chabreck”). Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments to the claims and the below arguments overcome the Examiner’s rejection.

The Amended Claims:

Applicants note that Claim 1 has been amended to specifically recite the use of glycidyl methacrylate (“GMA”). Applicants note that of the prior art that has been relied on by the Examiner none shows the production of coatings by pulsed plasma deposition using GMA as the monomeric feedstock. Although Kolluri does refer to GMA, it does not